

REMARKS

Claim amendments

Applicant amends the claims to correct minor grammatical errors. These amendments are not intended to change the scope of the claims and are therefore not expected to require further search.

Applicant also submits method claims that correspond to the pending system claims. These claims are also not expected to require further search.

Double-patenting rejection

In response to the double-patenting rejection of claims 1-16, Applicant cancels those claims.

Section 103 rejection

Claim 17 and its progeny stand rejected as being rendered obvious by *Harrison III*. As best understood, the Examiner considers *Harrison III* to map to claim 17 as follows:

An information display system for displaying information in at least one elevator cab in each of a plurality of buildings, said system comprising:	A system that displays information at POS displays, such as gas pumps.
a central server for compiling and transmitting information to be displayed;	Service bureau 12.
a display, including a display screen, located in each of said elevator cabs, said display being adapted to receive said information, whereby said information is displayed simultaneously on each said of said elevator cab display screens. ¹	Automated devices 10 and associated displays at POS terminals.

The Examiner concedes that the *Harrison III* lacks any teaching or suggestion of an information display system that displays information in elevator cabs, rather than at POS displays. However, the Examiner considers this to be a mere change in the environment of use.

¹ Claim as amended.

***Harrison III* fails to disclose simultaneous information display**

In response, Applicant draws particular attention to the claim language “whereby said information is displayed *simultaneously* on each said elevator cab screen.” The system of *Harrison III* fails to teach this limitation.

For example, in describing the functions carried out by the service bureau 12, *Harrison III* states that

“The service bureau 12 is also adapted to receive data relating to actual presentation of the information, such as number of times and times of day that certain advertisements were displayed, and other related information as desired from the automated devices 10, to store that data, and to report it as desired.”²

If all the displays had been displaying the information simultaneously, it is unclear why the service bureau would require such an adaptation. The clear inference from the foregoing passage is that the POS displays do *not* show information simultaneously, as recited in claim 1.

This inference is supported by numerous additional passages from *Harrison III*. For example, *Harrison III* describes the operation of the local system as follows:

“The local system may operate as follows. Until the detection of a customer via proximity sensors 38, the system presents background music or audio (and/or visual) information. When a customer is detected, the automated device 10 provides voice information to the relevant pump top display 34, such as a packet of advertisements. If a second customer approaches another pump, the proximity sensor 38 there causes that pump top presentation to switch to voice presentation as well. *The information changes depending on input from ambient noise sensors 37 and environmental sensors 40.*”³

It is clear from the foregoing that different POS displays are intended to show different information at different times. The particular information displayed at a POS display depends on the occurrence of random events associated with that POS display, e.g. detection of a customer at the POS. It is for this reason that the service bureau compiles statistics on what information was actually displayed.

² *Harrison III*, col. 3, lines 56-60.

³ *Harrison III*, col. 4, line 60 to col. 5, line 3 [emphasis supplied].

That *Harrison III* fails to teach the foregoing claim limitation is further supported by FIG. 5, and the accompanying discussion thereof, in which *Harrison III* describes how locally executing software selects what is to be displayed at the POS:

The software may check ambient noise sensors 37 in order to adjust volume level at individual pump tops as desired and then poll individual proximity sensors 38 in order to determine whether customers are present. *If* they are, the software *may* retrieve, communicate to display devices 38 and thus present audio and/or video messages on display devices 34.⁴

Harrison III also describes the software as periodically transmitting display statistics to the service bureau, a function that would be superfluous if all POS displays had been displaying the same information simultaneously:

[i]f no emergency exists, the software checks for incoming information from the service bureau 12, downloads it, stores it in appropriate locations and, if desired, uploads appropriate information to the service bureau 12. That information may include counts of ads or other information actually displayed, such counts keyed to proximity sensor readings in order to provide customer presence information, any or all of which may be keyed to sales information as desired.

That *Harrison III* is intended to display different information at different times is also apparent from claim 1, which recites:

“means contained in the automated device for varying the information content of the data disseminated to the at least one display device according to information received from the sensors”⁵

It is apparent, therefore, that *Harrison III* omits teaching of at least one structural limitation recited in claim 1. Thus, even if one could change *Harrison III*'s environment of use from POS displays to elevator displays, the resulting system would still fail to meet every limitation recited in the claim. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 103 rejection.

⁴ *Harrison III*, col. 5, lines 15-21. [emphasis supplied]

⁵ *Harrison III*, col. 6, lines 35-39.

Applicant : Stephen D. Amo et al.
Serial No. : 10/669,060
Filed : September 23, 2003
Page : 7 of 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 13589-012005

Summary

Now pending in this application are claims 17-24, of which claims 17 and 21 are independent. No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due, or if a refund is forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050 referencing attorney docket "13589-012005".

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/8/04



Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906